



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/556,829	11/15/2005	Wolfgang Ens	2033P06449WOUS	1656
22116	7590	10/16/2008	EXAMINER	
SIEMENS CORPORATION			FAYYAZ, NASHMIYA SAQIB	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH			2856	
ISELIN, NJ 08830			MAIL DATE	
			10/16/2008	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/556,829	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ENS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Nashmiya S. Fayyaz	<b>Art Unit</b> 2856

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 5-13 and 15-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-8, 13 and 15-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/946B)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election without traverse of **Species I**-testing with **one valve** in the reply filed on July 2, 2008 is acknowledged. However, upon re-evaluation of the claims, it is noted that claims 13 and 15-20 were *incorrectly* identified as generic claims as they are in fact, clearly drawn to a 2 valve arrangement and should be grouped with species II and cannot be considered generic claims.
2. Claims 5, 7-8, 13 and 15-20 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on July 2, 2008.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP-101091-(Kimura). As to claim 9, Kimura discloses a method and apparatus for inspecting a shut-off valve as depicted in fig. 3 where a first sound signal is recorded by microphone 12 in a open state of a valve and a second sound signal is recorded in the closed state of the valve and using the signal with the central attenuation level is then compared with a decision level to decide a good or no good valve and then is displayed on display 3, see Abstract translation and fig. 1 and 3. Further, Kimura discloses testing a shut off valve rather than a check valve of a pump and records the first signal with the valve open and then the second signal with the valve closed. However, the procedure does not seem to be limited to any type of specific valve and could be applicable to a check valve of a pump. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have recognized that the method of Kimura could be applicable to any type of valve such as a check valve of a pump since there is an open and closed state of such a valve. Further, as to the open and closed states being measured in a reverse fashion, it appears that the procedure is not altered by the states being reversed and the reversal would appear to be a mere matter of design choice. As to claim 9, Kimura discloses a

calculating device (calculation means), an evaluation device (valve open or close confirmation means 2a) and a signal output display 3 for displaying the result of the comparison, see abstract translation and fig. 1 and 3. Note that the last sound signal in the closed state is compared to the last sound signal in the open state. As to claims 10 and 11, these claims appear to be repetitive of claim 9 such that the limitations have been discussed. As to claim 12, note valve open/close confirmation means would appear to base the evaluation on the sound signals, note fig. 3.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 9, on line 4, it is unclear whether "a valve" is related to the "check valve" of line 1. On lines 5 and 10-11, "the valve" lacks clear antecedent basis. On line 8, "the valve state" lacks antecedent basis. On line 9, "the fault" lacks antecedent basis. Also, on lines 9 and 10, "level" should probably be --value--. Further, claims 10 and 11 are repetitive of claim 9.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nashmiya S. Fayyaz whose telephone number is 571-272-2192. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays and Thursdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hezron E. Williams can be reached on 571-272-2208. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. S. F./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2856  
/Hezron Williams/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2856